

**REMARKS**

Claims 3-8 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 3 is amended and claims 7 and 8 are added. Support for the amendments can be found at least at Figures 2 and 3. See e.g., page 6, lines 16 - page 8, line 27. Thus no new matter is been added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Simitoski and Morese on August 23. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

**I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

**A. Rejection of Claim 3**

The Office Action rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0014615 to Dahm et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dahm does not disclose "a storage media, which stores for each user, a plurality of communication terminal IDs, a personal ID and a personal information of user,... the personal ID being correlated with each of the plurality of communication terminal IDs," as recited in claim 3. That is, Dahm does not disclose a storage media that stores at least one communication terminal ID and personal information, which is correlated with the personal ID, so that regardless of the number of the communication terminals used by the user, one personal ID is set for a user. See e.g., column 8, lines 5-23 and Figures 2 and 3.

In contrast, the system of Dahm only discloses a data structure 390 wherein each record includes information by a subscriber, such as a device ID, subscriber ID, and the user information for the account. See e.g., Dahm, paragraph [0035] in Figure 3. Because Dahm does not correlate the communication terminal ID and personal information with the personal ID as recited in claim 3, Dahm does not disclose a claimed storage media.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed, as well as the reasons discussed in the Request for Reconsideration After Final Rejection filed August 20, claim 3 is patentable over Dahm. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**B. Rejection of Claims 4-6**

The Office Action rejects claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,065,120 to Laursen et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4-6 are not anticipated by Laursen. Laursen does not disclose "retrieving a personal ID of the user based on the information terminal ID from a storage media, the storage media storing for each user, the personal ID being correlated with each of the plurality of information terminal IDs," as recited in claim 4.

In contrast, each of the devices of Laursen has a unique device ID that corresponds to a user account and a server, respectfully. See e.g., Dahm, column 7, lines 63-65. Nowhere does Dahm disclose a personal ID being correlated with each of the plurality of information terminals so that regardless of the number of communication terminals used by the user, one personal ID is set for the user as in the instant application.

Thus, claim 4 is patentable over Dahm. Further, claims 5 and 6, which depend from claim 4 is also patentable over Dahm for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 4, as well as the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**C. New Claims 7 and 8**

None of the applied references teach or suggest "an information processing system, a storage media that includes a first database and a second database, for each accessing user, "the first database correlating the personal ID in each of the plurality of communication terminal IDs," as recited in claim 3. Similarly, none of the applied references teach or suggest an information processing method, "wherein the storage media includes a first database and a

second database, for each accessing user, the retrieving step further comprising correlating, with the first database, the personal ID and each of the plurality of information terminal IDs," as recited in new claim 8.

Furthermore, claims 7 and 8 depend from claims 3 and 4, respectively. Thus, claims 7 and 8 are patentable over the applied references for at the reasons discussed with respect to claims 3 and 4, as well as the additional features recited therein.

## II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs  
Registration No. 56,046

Linda M. Saltiel.  
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:RBI/jfb

Attachment:  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: September 16, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--